



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/805,324

03/22/2004

Hiroki Kitamura

00862.023507.

9095

5514

7590

10/20/2008

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

STOREY, WILLIAM C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/20/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 10/10/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

2. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., cannot accept various types of printheads) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Further, applicant claims that Takemura teaches a printhead printing with a fixed number of concurrently, but not according to distributed driving. However, it has previously been discussed that Takemura discloses driving every 2 nozzles in sequence, which read on distributed driving for a predetermined number of nozzles. This taken with fig. 43d for 360dpi (top of page), for example, shows two nozzles used concurrently. Thus, there are a number of concurrently drivable printing elements according to distributed driving. This was previously stated in the prior office action. As applicant has provided no rationale against the discussions of the prior office action in order to support the statement made in the remarks, the prior rejection will stand.

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to amendments not entered are moot.